

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CWP No. 18913 of 2004
Date of Decision : 24.5.2007

Raghubir Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and Others

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M.M. KUMAR

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND KUMAR

Present: Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amol Rattan Singh, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

JUDGEMENT

M.M. KUMAR, J.

The prayer made in this petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution is for quashing order dated 8-6-2004 (P1) passed by the Managing Director, Punjab Police Housing Corporation and the order dated 4-10-2004 (P2) passed by the Board of Directors of the Punjab Police Corporation. The Managing Director in a detailed order dated 8-6-2004 (P1) has endorsed the view of the inquiry officer who had concluded that the petitioner has failed to maintain absolute integrity and devotion to duty; and that he has conducted himself in a manner which is unbecoming of a Corporation employee. He was found to have violated Rules 3(1) (i), (ii) and (iii) of the Government Employees (Conduct) Rules, 1966. The

Managing Director further recorded his agreement with regard to finding of charge No.2 and 3. The Managing Director had issued a show cause notice proposing the punishment to withhold five increments with cumulative effect. However, taking a lenient view by expressing the hope that the petitioner would conduct himself in proper and responsible manner, the Managing Director awarded him punishment of withholding of two increments with cumulative effect in accordance with Rule 5(V) of the Punjab Civil Services (Punishment and Appeal) Rules 1970 (for brevity the '1970 Rules'). The aforementioned order passed by the Managing Director was upheld by the Board of Directors on the appeal filed by the petitioner by order dated 4-10-2004 (P2).

After hearing the learned counsel, we are of the considered view that no interference of this Court would be warranted because neither any violation of principles of natural justice or that of mandatory provisions of the 1970 Rules have been pointed out nor it has been argued that the findings are without any evidence. After perusal of the paper book along with annexures, we are left with no option but to conclude that the inquiry proceedings have been conducted in accordance with the 1970 Rules. There is no room for us to interfere in the order of punishment.

The writ petition is wholly without merit. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

(M.M. KUMAR)
JUDGE

May 24, 2007
Amit

(ARVIND KUMAR)
JUDGE